

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of June 23, 2004, has been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims.

Double Patenting

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6743395.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Submitted herewith is a terminal disclaimer which should overcome this double patenting rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As the terminal disclaimer submitted with the present amendment should be sufficient to overcome the double

Appln. No. 10/804,085
Amd. dated September 21, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 23, 2004

patenting rejection of claim 1, it is believed that claims 2-4
are no longer dependent upon a rejected base claim.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted
that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and
favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\W\Wata\Fukunaga 3A\PTO\AMD 21SEP04.doc